

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the drawings as follows:

Please replace all of the drawings with the enclosed formal Replacement Sheets in which:

In Fig. 3, the reference number “104” has been deleted; and

In Fig. 5, the reference number “104” has been deleted and the reference number “522” has been replaced with -- 312 -- .

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 7-11, 20-24 and 33-37 have been amended, claims 1-6, 14-19, 27-32 and 40-52 have been cancelled, and new claims 53-96 have been added. The claims amendments are not for purposes of patentability, but merely to change the reference to the claim number from which the amended claims depends or to broaden the claim language. Further, the specification has been amended, and the drawings have been replaced with formal drawings, both as discussed in more detail below. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39 and 53-96 will be pending in this application. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Drawings/Specification

The examiner has objected to the lack of certain reference numbers in the drawings. In response, the Applicants have reviewed the specification and drawings, and have amended the specification as noted above and have replaced and amended the drawings as noted above. The Replacement Sheets submitted herewith do not introduce any new matter, and are not being used to overcome any insufficiency of the specification due to lack of an enabling disclosure or otherwise inadequate disclosure therein, or to supplement the original disclosure thereof for the purpose of interpretation of the scope of any claim. The amendments to the specification include changes to the reference numbers based on drawing changes filed with the Amendment dated February 27, 2006. Further, the Applicants have made a few additional amendments to the specification and drawings, as noted above, to insure that like elements have like reference numbers throughout the drawings. As such, based on these amendments, the objection to the

drawings is moot. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter these amendments and replacement drawings, and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Hung and Clark

The examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 14-20, 27-33 and 40-46 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over US Pub. No. 2002/0087584 to Hung (“Hung”) in view of US Patent No. 6,725,228 to Clark et al. (“Clark”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as being moot.

In particular, this rejection is now moot with respect to previously presented independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 40, as these claims have been canceled. Likewise, this rejection is moot with respect to previously presented dependent claims 2-7, 15-20, 28-33 and 41-46 as these claims have either been canceled or have been amended to depend from an allowable new independent claim, as is discussed below.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 14-20, 27-33 and 40-46 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Clark.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Hung and Freeze

The examiner has rejected claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35 and 47-48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over US Pub. No. 2002/0087584 to Hung in view of the document entitled “Sam’s Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours” to Freeze (“Freeze”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as being moot.

In particular, this rejection is moot with respect to previously presented dependent claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35 and 47-48, as these claims either have been amended to depend from an allowable new independent claim, as discussed below, or have been canceled.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35 and 47-48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Freeze.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Hung, Clark and Freeze

The examiner has rejected claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over US Pub. No. 2002/0087584 to Hung in view of US Patent No. 6,725,228 to Clark et al. ("Clark") and further in view of the document entitled "Sam's Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours" to Freeze ("Freeze"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, this rejection is moot with respect to previously presented dependent claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52, as these claims either have been amended to depend from an allowable new independent claim, as discussed below, or have been canceled.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Clark and further in view of Freeze.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 53-96 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled. These new claims are fully supported throughout the specification. Further, these new

claims are not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the prior art. Thus, new claims 53-96 are allowable.

In particular, independent claim 53 recites a method for transferring a document into a folder, comprising:

- presenting a document on a user interface of an apparatus;
- receiving from a user of the apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document; and
- automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification.

Independent claim 62 recites a computer readable medium including instructions stored thereon, comprising:

- a first set of instructions for presenting a document on a user interface of an apparatus;
- a second set of instructions for receiving from a user of the apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document; and
- a third set of instructions for automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification.

Independent claim 71 recites an apparatus for transferring a document into a folder, comprising:

- means for presenting a document on a user interface of the apparatus;
- means for receiving from a user of the apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document; and
- means for automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification.

Independent claim 80 recites an apparatus, comprising:

- a processor;
- a memory communicatively coupled with the processor, the memory operable to store a document;
- an output device communicatively coupled with the processor and the memory, wherein the output device is operable by the processor to present the document;

an input device communicatively coupled with the processor, wherein the input device is operable to receive from a user of the apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document during a presentation of the document by the output device; and

wherein the processor is operable to automatically transfer the document into a folder in the memory, the folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification.

Independent claim 96 recites at least one processor configured to perform the actions of:

presenting a document on a user interface of an apparatus;
receiving from a user of the apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document; and
automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification.

Each of these independent claims is patentable over any combination of Hung, Clark and/or Freeze, as the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest a method, computer readable medium, apparatus and/or processor comprising, *inter alia*, the subject matter related to receiving from a user of an apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of a document during a presentation of the document by the apparatus, and automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification, as recited by these independent claims.

In contrast to the recited subject matter of receiving from a user of an apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of a document during a presentation of the document by the apparatus, the prior art discloses either prompting the user to execute a series of selections in order to transfer the document to a folder or transferring the document to a folder based on pre-existing filtering parameters. In particular, Hung discloses a method that “prompt[s] the user to select at least one value from the message.”¹ More specifically, Hung discloses displaying a message on a screen having a bottom portion with

¹ Hung, paragraph 42 on page 4, lines 2 and 3 on page 4.

“a number of choices selectable by the user . . . [o]ne such choice may [be] a ‘SAVE’ choice. In response to user selection of that choice, for instance, the machine may then prompt the user to select a folder under which the user wishes to store the message . . . At that screen, the user may select ‘Saved/Draft’ to indicate a desire to store the message in a folder under the Saved/Draft category . . . Alternatively . . . the user may select ‘New Folder’ to indicate a desire to store the message in a new folder. In response, . . . the machine may present the user with a number of choices for auto-filing of the message. One such choice may be ‘Keyword,’ to facilitate creation of a new folder based on a keyword selected from the message itself . . . in response to user selection of the ‘Keyword’ choice, the machine may scrollably display the text of the message in the top portion of the screen and may provide a ‘Select’ choice in the bottom of the screen. Using scroll keys, a dial, or another suitable actuator, the user may then scroll through the message, directing the machine to highlight each consecutive word of the message. . . In response to user actuation of the ‘Select’ choice-item, the machine may then automatically establish ‘select’ . . . as a message-filter expression and associate that message-filter expression with a folder in the data storage means. . . once the machine has associated a message-filter expression with a message folder, if the machine receives a new message, the machine may responsively determine whether the new message satisfies the message-filter expression . . . associated with any of the existing folders.”²

As such, Hung relies on prompting the user, in an extended and laborious process, to indicate a “Keyword” based on receiving a “Saved/Draft” selection from the user.

Further, Hung does not disclose or suggest automatically transferring the document to a folder based on the unprompted identification of the portion, as recited by the claims.

Thus, Hung does not disclose or suggest receiving from a user of an apparatus an unprompted identification of a portion of a document during a presentation of the document by the apparatus, and automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, unprompted identification, as recited by independent claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96.

The addition of Clark does not cure the deficiencies of Hung. Clark discloses a system for managing and organizing stored electronic messages which requires a catalog database 28

² Hung at paragraphs 61-66 and 70; and Fig. 4.

and a catalog server 29 to manage and organize messages in a plurality of different folders.³ In particular, Clark requires the creation of a shortcut table 57, which “plays a *key* role in associating messages with folders. The term ‘lightweight message shortcut’ may be used to refer to the information in a row in shortcut table 57. A lightweight message shortcut may reside in the shortcut table and may also reside in a data structure in the catalog server 29 or the message client 27. . . . The provision and use of lightweight message shortcuts . . . is a *key* aspect of this invention.” (emphasis added)⁴ Further, Clark describes methods for constructing lightweight message shortcuts.⁵ In the system of Clark, including the structure and method of creating shortcuts, there is disclosure or suggestion of receiving from a user of an apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of a document during a presentation of the document by the apparatus, and automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification, as recited by independent claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96. Thus, the combination of Hung and Clark do not disclose or suggest the recited subject matter.

The further addition of Freeze does not solve the deficiencies of Hung and Clark. Freeze deals with a file download dialog box. As such, Freeze does not disclose nor suggest receiving from a user of an apparatus an un-prompted identification of a portion of a document during a presentation of the document by the apparatus, and automatically transferring the document into a folder associated with the portion based on the received, un-prompted identification, as recited by independent claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96.

Thus, independent claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96 are patentable over any combination of Hung, Clark and/or Freeze.

³ Clark at col. 9, lines 55-67.

⁴ *Id.* at col. 23, lines 39-50.

⁵ *Id.* at col. 24, line 10 to col. 25, line 43.

For at least these same reasons, all of the claims depending from independent claims 53, 62, 71 and 80 are patentable over any combination of Hung, Clark and/or Freeze. In particular, claims 7-13 and 54-61 depend from claim 53; claims 20-26 and 63-70 depend from claim 62; claims 33-39 and 72-79 depend from claim 71; and claims 81-95 depend from claim 80. Further, each of claims 7-13 and 54-61, 20-26 and 63-70, 33-39 and 72-79 and 81-95 are independently patentable as they each recite a combination of subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the prior art.

Thus, for the reasons stated above, new claims 53-96 as well as previously presented claims 7-13, 20-26 and 33-39 are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39 and 53-96.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 23, 2006

:

By: /Robert J. O'Connell/

Robert J. O'Connell

Reg. No. 44,265

(858) 651-4361

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502